DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 650 CS 501 891

AUTHOR Garrison, John P.; Andersen, Peter A.
TITLE Media Consumption and Population Characteristics of Political Opinion Leaders.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Berlin, Germany, May 29-June 4, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Leaders; *Information Sources; Interpersonal Relationship; *Leadership Qualities; *Mass Media; Political Attitudes; Political Influences; Political Socialization; *Politics; *Public Opinion; Social Influences

ABSTRACT

This study examines the information sources and population characteristics that differentiate political opinion-leaders from nonleaders. A telephone poll of 339 subjects provided data indicating that political opinion leaders receive more information about candidates from all media, as well as through interpersonal communication, than do nonleaders. No significant age differences were found between political opinion-leaders and nonleaders, but males were significantly more likely to be leaders than were females. Finally, political opinion-leaders were found to be more likely to develop and to state their preferences for a political candidate than were nonleaders. Implications of the results and suggestions for future research are discussed. (Author/RL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146650

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

MEDIA CONSUMPTION AND POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS OF POLITICAL OPINION LEADERS

BY

John P. Garrison

Department of Speech Communication

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

and

Peter A. Andersen

Department of Speech Communication

West Virginia University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John P. Garrison
Peter A. Andersen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention: An International Congress on Communication Sciences, Berlin, Germany, May 29-June 4, 1977.

CS501 891

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of the present study was to examine the information sources from which political opinion leaders and nonleaders received information about candidates. Sex and age characteristics of political opinion leaders and nonleaders were also examined. Finally, data was gathered to determine if political opinion leaders are more likely to develop political candidate preferences than nonleaders. Results demonstrated that political opinion leaders receive more information about candidates from all media as well as through interpersonal communication. No significant age differences were found between political opinion leaders and nonleaders. Males, however, were significantly more likely to be political opinion leaders than females. Finally, it was found that political opinion leaders are more likely to develop and state their preference for a political candidate than were nonleaders. Implications of the results and suggestions for future research are discussed.

MEDIA CONSUMPTION AND POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS OF POLITICAL OPINION LEADERS*

An important link in the mass communication process is provided by opinion leaders who receive information from the media and pass it on to their followers. Although this relationship has been studied in several settings, little recent research has involved political opinion leaders and very little is presently known about their media consumption behavior. Since opinion leadership in modern societies is somewhat monomorphic,[1] it is important to examine political opinion leadership specifically rather than generalized, polymorphic opinion leadership. This study also examines the sex and age of political opinion leaders as well as the degree to which they form political preferences.

THE MASS MEDIA AND POPULATION OPINION LEADERS

This section examines a crucial link in the political communication process. Specifically, to what extent do opinion leaders receive information from media and interpersonal sources? Since political opinion leaders are the link in a multistep flow of potential communication,[2] determining the media from which opinion leaders receive information, provides important evidence on the impact of specific media channels on the political decisions of the general society.

Considerable general evidence exists that opinion leaders have greater mass media exposure than their followers.[3] The greater general media exposure of opinion leaders has been demonstrated for peasants in underdeveloped countries,[4] for general opinion leaders,[5] and for political opinion leaders.[6] Two questions remain unanswered by this body of research: First, these studies examined general media contact, and not the channel through which <u>specific information</u> was obtained. Second, the relative influence of the various media is seldom critically examined. This section of the present report is an attempt to examine the specific media through which information flows to opinion leaders. The

following hypotheses (H1-H5) are designed to test the political information sources of opinion leaders and non-leaders.

Radio and Opinion Leadership. Studies conducted prior to the development of television indicate that radio was a particularly important information source. Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet[7] reported that radio was the most helpful and important source of political campaign information. Katz and Lazarsfeld[8] found that opinion leaders in general had more radio contact than nonleaders. However, their study indicated that political opinion leaders do not spend more time listening to the radio than do nonleaders. These studies did not examine what type of radio messages were actually listened to. Because of the general finding that radio is a primary source of information for opinion leaders it was hypothesized that:

H_1: Political opinion leaders receive more information about candidates from radio than do nonleaders.

Television and Opinion Leadership. The major studies that originally examined political opinion leadership were, unfortunately, conducted before television had an impact on political campaigns.[9] It has previously been established that both opinion leaders in general and political opinion leaders in specific have greater general media exposure than do nonleaders. Additionally, evidence indicated that persons highly exposed to one medium also tend to be highly exposed to other media.[10] Since television was not examined in the early political opinion leadership research it seems logical that the effect observed at the time for media in general will also be observed for television today. It was therefore hypothesized that:

H_2: Political opinion leaders receive more information about candidates from television than do nonleaders.

Magazines and Opinion Leadership. A series of studies reports that opinion leaders receive and read journals and magazines more frequently than do nonleaders.

Lionberger[11] in a study of agricultural opinion leaders reported that opinion leaders subscribed to far more farming magazines than did non-leaders. Manzel and Katz,[12] in a report on opinion leaders in the medical profession, found that opinion leaders read medical journals more frequently than did nonleaders. In a study of public affairs opinion leaders, Katz and Lazarsfeld[13] found that opinion leaders read more magazines than nonleaders, regardless of educational level. These studies indicate that opinion leaders read more relevant magazines than do nonleaders but the amount of information they receive has not been examined. In order to test this relationship the following hypothesis was advanced:

H_3: Political opinion leaders receive more information about candidates from magazines than do nonleaders.

Newspapers and Opinion Leadership. Previous research has reported that opinion leaders subscribe to and read more newspapers than do nonleaders. Agricultural opinion leaders were found to subscribe to more daily and weekly newspapers than did nonleaders.[14] General opinion leaders were found to read more newspapers than did nonleaders.[15] Additionally, Lazarsfeld, et. al.[16] found that persons who have greater magazine and radio exposure also have greater newspaper exposure. Since it has been demonstrated previously that opinion leaders have more magazine and radio exposure it may be assumed that they will have greater newspaper exposure. Finally, Sheinkopf and O'Keefe[17] found that politically knowledgeable persons rely on print media more than any other media. This body of evidence strongly suggests that opinion leaders receive more candidate information via newspapers than do nonleaders, but this hypothesis has not been tested. It was therefore hypothesized that:

H_4: Political opinion leaders receive more information about candidates from newspapers than do nonleaders.

Interpersonal Communication and Opinon Leadership. Some evidence exists that opinion leaders receive more information through interpersonal channels than do nonleaders. Rahudkar's[18] study of villagers in India found that neighbor to neighbor communication was more important in the diffusion process than any other communication channel. Menzel and Katz[19] reported that medical opinion leaders attended more professional meetings than did nonleaders. Rogers and Shoemaker[20] report that opinion leaders have greater social participation than do followers. While this evidence is quite limited, the nature of the opinion leadership construct would lead to the conclusion that opinion leaders receive more information through interpersonal channels than do nonleaders. The discussions that opinion leaders engage in probably entail receiving as well as providing information, unless it could be demonstrated that other people do not speak in their interactions with opinion leaders. Moreover, during the greater social participation of opinion leaders interpersonal messages are probably received as well as sent. Therefore it was hypothesized that:

H_5: Political opinion leaders receive more information about candidates from interpersonal communication sources than do nonleaders.

POPULATION TRAITS AND POLITICAL OPINION LEADERS

This section examines the relationship between political opinion leadership and the population characteristics of age and sex.

Age and Opinion Leadership. Evidence on age and opinion leadership is inconsistent and confusing. Rogers and Svenning[21] in their study of Columbian peasants, found that opinion leaders were younger in modern than in traditional systems. They found the average age of opinion leaders to be 45 to 50 years. Lionberger[22] in a study of agricultural opinion leaders in Missouri, found no difference in the average age of opinion leaders and nonleaders, which was approximately 50 years of age. Average ages are inappropriate statistics since

they demonstrate little about the incidence of opinion leadership at various age levels. Modes that indicate peaks of opinion leadership at particular ages would be more useful to theory builders and political advertisers interested in knowing at what age opinion leadership is most likely to be manifested.

Additional findings indicate a peak of political activity at middle age. Miller [23] reports low voting turnout for young voters and very old voters in all elections, particularly in non-Presidential elections. Sears[24] and Verba and Nie[25] found that persons of middle age participate in campaigns more than either young or old persons. Katz and Lazarsfeld[26] reported that young people of both sexes were less interested in, less informed about, and participated less in politics than older persons. This evidence would seem to indicate that persons of middle age would be more likely to be opinion leaders than younger or older persons.

Lionberger,[27] in a study of agricultural opinion leadership, found a marked decline in opinion leadership among persons over sixty years of age. Katz and Lazarsfeld[28] found that public affairs opinion leaders tended to be middle aged, while their followers tended to be younger. This downward opinion leadership trend was observed both inside and outside of the family. Based on this and previous evidence it was hypothesized that:

H_6: Political opinion leadership is greater for middle aged persons than for young or old persons.

Sex and Opinion Leadership. Despite the political equality accorded women, when a legal standpoint, evidence abounds that politics is a male-dominated, male controlled arena. Men occupy a vast majority of elected and appointed offices in the United States. Women tend to be far less involved in political campaigns than are men.[29] Evidence also demonstrates that women are less likely to vote than are men.[30] Political activities, decisions, and power are male dominated in the United States.

A number of studies indicate that women seldom act as political opinion leaders. Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McPhee[31] found that most political conversations, particularly for women, go on within the family. Moreover, several studies[32] found that 84 to 93 per cent of partisan affiliation was identical for married couples. Katz and Lazarsfeld[33] found that women seldom designate other women for public affairs opinion leaders. Instead, men are preferred as opinion leaders about public affairs. Richmond and McCroskey[34] provide a recent replication of Katz and Lazarsfeld's findings in an era of women's liberation. They found that women select other women as fashion opinion leaders 80 to 90 per cent of the time. Likewise, women selected other women as movie opinion leaders about half the time. However, women selected other women as political opinion leaders only about 20 per cent of the time. These replicated findings indicate that political opinion leadership is still a man's domain. The present study examines self-reported opinion leadership, rather than sociometrically obtained opinion leadership, and hypothesizes that:

H_7: The incidence of political opinion leadership is greater for males than for females.

PREFERENCE FORMATION OF OPINION LEADERS

A final question examined in this study, is whether opinion leaders make more decisions regarding their own voting intention. If opinion leaders do make a decision about which candidate they prefer we can expect that they will use their role of opinion leader to influence the voting decisions of others. Limited evidence indicates that opinion leaders are much more politically alert and interested, and less apathetic than their followers.[35] If non-opinion leaders are more apathetic they would probably be less likely to report a voting preference than would opinion leaders. It was therefore hypothesized that:

H_8: Political opinion leaders will form candidate preferences more frequently than nonleaders.

METHOD

Sample

Three hundred thirty-nine subjects were included in the present study. The sample was drawn from the Tallahassee, Florida, numerical phone directory using a systematic sample with a random start.[36] The study was conducted in conjunction with the 1974 Democratic primary election for United States Senator from Florida between Bill Gunter and Dick Stone. Thus, all subjects were registered Democrats. If a subject did not respond or was not a registered Democrat, the next consecutive phone number was called. Phone numbers in Tallahassee are assigned by neighborhood thus the second number called was likely to share similar socio-economic characteristics.[37]

Procedures

Ten telephone interview sessions were conducted during the week prior to the primary run-off, October 1, 1974. Five female and five male undergraduate students volunteered to be interviewers in this study. All of the interviewers were enrolled in an undergraduate course in survey sampling. During three seminar sessions the interviewers were trained in the theory and practice of survey research.

During data collection sessions, each interviewer called a primary sample number. At the opening of the interview, each subject was told that a survey on political opinion was being conducted. The subject was then asked if he/she had heard or read anything about Bill Gunter, where he or she had read or heard anything about him and for what office he was running. The same questions were repeated regarding Dick Stone. If the subject had not read or heard about Bill Gunter or Dick Stone, the interview was conducted but only demographic data was collected.

The subject was asked if he or she was a registered Democrat. If the response was no, the subject was asked if anyone in that household was a registered Democrat. If no one in the household was a registered Democrat, the interview was terminated. Each registered Democrat was interviewed for approximately fifteen minutes during which he/she was asked a series of questions about the candidates, themselves, and the mass media.

Independent Variables

The independent variable for the first six hypotheses (H1-H6) was political opinion leadership operationalized via a single ordinal scale with five possible responses. Each subject was asked, "How often do people ask your opinion about politics?" They responded by choosing from the following options: very often, often, sometimes, seldom and never. This operationalization is consistent with previous research.[38] Self-report measures were deemed more appropriate than sociometric or key informant techniques since these latter methods require that all persons in a given group be able to identify each other. However, evidence exists for the construct validity of self-report measures since self-reports correlated moderately, but significantly, with other measures of opinion leadership.[39]

The two final independent variables were sex and candidate preference. Subjects were asked, If elections were held today, who would you vote for in the United States Senate Race?" The options were Bill Gunter, Dick Stone, or "choose not to vote." If the voters selected one of the two candidates then they had a preference, otherwise they entered the "no preference" category. The validity of this type of self-report of voter preference has been widely established by public opinion surveyors[40] and mass media researchers.[41]

Dependent Variables

Six dependent variables were utilized in the present study. Procedures during the interview session were consistent for the first five dependent variables, involving media usage. Subjects were initially asked a forced

choice question, "Have you heard or read anything about Bill Gunter?" If the subject responded "yes" to this question, a second forced choice question was utilized for each of the five media channels. The second question was "where did you hear or read anything about Bill Gunter?" This same procedure was then repeated for the other candidate, Dick Stone. This procedure generated data which assessed whether a subject had heard about neither candidate, heard about one candidate, or heard about both candidates by each media channel.

The dependent variables were: (1) information heard about the two political candidates via radio; (2) information heard about the two political candidates on television; (3) information read about the two political candidates in magazines; (4) information obtained about the two political candidates by reading newspapers; (5) information obtained about the two political candidates from interpersonal communication (6) age (subjects responses were coded into four categories: 18-30; 31-45; 46-65; and over 65); and (7) opinion leadership, which was used as the independent variable for the first six analyses.

Statistical Analyses

The first six hypotheses were tested with Pearson Product-Moment correlations and chi-square tests.[42] The data employed in the study is amenable to parametric analysis, such as correlations, since it is ordinal data of approximately equal intervals. Since a more conservative approach is to treat all data as nominal, chi-square analyses were also performed. To guard against excessive experiment-wise errors, alpha level for all hypotheses was set at .02.

RESULTS

Seven of the eight hypotheses were confirmed. Only hypothesis six was not confirmed.

Hypothesis one was confirmed (see table 1). Political opinion leaders

received more information about candidates from radio than did nonleaders ($r = 17$, $p < .002$). However, when the data was analyzed with the chi square statistic the hypothesis was not confirmed ($x^2 = 13.65$, p .02).

Insert table 1 about here

Hypothesis two was confirmed (see table two). Political opinion leaders received more information about candidates from television than did non-leaders ($r = .26$, $p < .0001$; $x^2 = 13.65$, $p < .0003$).

Insert table 2 about here

Hypothesis three was confirmed (see table 3). Political opinion leaders received more information about candidates from magazines than did nonleaders ($r = .16$, $p < .004$). However, when data was analyzed using the chi square statistic, the hypothesis was not confirmed ($x^2 = 13.96$, $p < .02$).

Insert table 3 about here

Hypothesis four was confirmed (see table 4). Political opinion leaders received significantly more information about candidates from newspapers than did nonleaders ($r = .23$, $p < .0001$; $x^2 = 30.49$, $p < .0002$).

Insert table 4 about here

Hypothesis five was confirmed (see table 5). Political opinion leaders received significantly more information about candidates through interpersonal communication channels than did nonleaders ($r = .25$, $p < .0001$; $x^2 = 27.90$, $p < .0005$).

Insert table 5 about here

Hypothesis six was not confirmed (see table 6). Political opinion leadership was not significantly greater for middle age persons than for young or old persons. ($r = .07$, $p < .02$; $x^2 = 16.76$, $p < .02$).

Insert table 6 about here

Hypothesis 7 was confirmed. (see table 7). The incidence of political opinion leadership was greater for males than for females ($f = 6.58$, $p < .01$).

Insert table 7 about here

Hypothesis 8 was confirmed (see table 8). Political opinion leaders formed voting preferences more frequently than nonleaders ($F = 8.86$, $p < .003$).

Insert table 8 about here

DISCUSSION

Interpretation of the Results

The major findings of the present study was that political opinion leaders receive more political information through all channels, than do nonleaders. In short, political opinion leaders are frequent and important political communicators. They provide a vital link in the dissemination of political candidate information.

This study supported the hypotheses that political opinion leaders received more information through all channels than did nonleaders. For two of these channels, radio and magazines, the hypothesis was supported only if correlations were used, but not if chisquares statistics were used. Moreover, the variance accounted for in these two relationships was less than 3%. The other three channels, television, newspaper, and interpersonal communication all were clearly used significantly more by political opinion leaders than nonleaders. Television is a widely used source of candidate information by political opinion leaders but is seldom used by nonleaders (see table 2). This is an important finding because studies examining political opinion leadership were conducted prior to the widespread adoption of television in America.

Newspapers were found to be a widely used candidate information source for

political opinion leaders but not for nonleaders (see table 4). While agricultural opinion leaders [43] and general opinion leaders[44] were previously found to use newspapers more than nonleaders, this finding had not been extended to political opinion leaders prior to the present study.

Limited evidence for non-political opinion leaders indicate that these leaders receive more information from interpersonal sources than do nonleaders. The present study demonstrates that political opinion leaders receive considerably more information through interpersonal channels than do nonleaders (see table 5).

A related, unhypothesized finding showed that newspapers were the most important source about political candidates in a state race. Sixty nine per cent of high opinion leaders and fifty seven per cent of the entire population, read about at least one candidate through newspapers. The second most widely used source of candidate information was television. Fifty two per cent of high opinion leaders and fourty four per cent of the entire population had heard about at least one candidate on television. Interpersonal communication was a moderately important candidate information source for both opinion leaders and nonleaders. Thirty six per cent of high opinion leaders and 20 per cent of the entire population heard about at least one candidate through interpersonal channels. Radio was a source of information about one candidate for only 26.7% of high opinion leaders and only 18.6% of the general population. Magazines are apparently seldom used as sources of candidate information in state races. Only 6.6% of high opinion leaders and 2.1% of the entire population read about either candidate in magazines.

It was hypothesized that persons of middle age were more likely to be political opinion leaders than either younger or older persons. The present study failed to confirm this hypothesis. However, the findings were in the hypothesized direction (see table 6). Results indicated a trend toward higher opinion leadership at 31-45 years of age.

A series of recent studies has found that males were more likely to be opinion leaders than were females. The present study successfully replicated these results. Politics is still an area dominated by the male sex (see table 7).

A final hypothesis predicted that political opinion leaders were much more likely to form voting preferences than were nonleaders. A positive linear relationship supported this hypothesis. This finding indicates that opinion leaders not only provide information to other persons but also are more likely to support a specific candidate and therefore to have a specific idea of who the best candidate is. These two findings indicate that opinion leaders have considerable impact on their followers in the political communication process.

Limitations of the Study

Three possible limitations of the present research should be considered in interpreting the results. First, the study was conducted in Tallahassee, Florida, and therefore the results of this study can probably be generalized only to the urban south. Florida does attract persons from throughout the country and persons from throughout the state move to Tallahassee, the state capital. Thus, while some degree of generalazability exists, the study should be replicated in a non-southern setting.

A second limitation is that the entire sample consisted of Registered Democrats. In the south, persons of varying political views (i.e. liberals and conservatives) tend to vote Democratic, so this sample may be more representative than a northern Democratic sample. Nevertheless, these results cannot be freely extended to Republican voters.

A final limitation involves the level of data used in the present study. The five step opinion leadership scale and the three-step media information scale are both ordinal scales with relatively equal intervals. Moreover, since they are single-item scales their internal reliability

is impossible to assess. For readers who have qualms about subjecting ordinal scales with unknown reliability to parametric analyses, chi-square statistics were computed which treated the data as nominal. Greater precision and predictability of measurement could be attained through the use of an interval or ratio level opinion leadership scale. Such a scale has recently been developed and successfully used in communication research.[45]

Implications for Media in Campaigns

Several important implications for persons utilizing media in statewide campaigns should be noted. First, campaigns should attempt to inform, persuade, and recruit opinion leaders. This study indicates that opinion leaders are particularly important for several reasons. Previous research indicated that they communicate with and persuade other persons more frequently than most people. The present study indicates that they receive more information from all sources, mediated or interpersonal, and are far more likely to develop a political preference in a campaign.

A second implication is that newspapers, television, and interpersonal channels are most crucial for informing voters about political candidates. Radio and magazines seem to play distinctly less important roles in statewide campaigns. This finding was consistent for political opinion leaders and for the general voting population.

A final implication of the study is that political opinion leaders have a strong tendency to be male and a slight tendency to be in the 31-45 year age range. Campaign appeals designed for males and persons in the 31-45 year age range should successfully reach a disproportionately high percentage of opinion leaders.

[1]Monomorphic and polymorphic opinion leadership is discussed in Everett M. Rogers and F. Floyd Shoemaker, Communication of Innovations (New York: Free Press, 1971) pp. 223-225.

[2]Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson and Hazel Gaudet, The Peoples Choice (New York: Prentice Hall, 1944).

[3]Rogers and Shoemaker, Generalization 6-10, p. 218.

[4]Everett M. Rogers and Lynne Svenning, Modernization Among Peasants (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969).

[5]Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence (New York: Free Press, 1955); Kurt Lang and Gladys Lang, "Mass Media and Voting", in E. Burdick & A. J. Brodbeck (eds.), American Voting Behavior (Glencoe Illinois: Free Press, 1959), 217-235.

[6]Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet, p. 51.

[7]Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet, pp. 125-129.

[8]Katz and Lazarsfeld, p. 312.

[9]Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet; Katz and Lazarsfeld.

[10]Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet, pp. 121-123.

[11]Herbert Lionberger, "Some Characteristics of Farm Operators Sought as Sources of Farm Information in a Missouri Community", Rural Sociology, 18 (1953), 327-328.

[12]Herbert Menzel and Elihu Katz, "Social Relations and Innovation in the Medical Profession: The Epidemiology of a New Drug", Public Opinion Quarterly, 19 (1955), 337-352.

[13]Katz and Lazarsfeld, pp. 310-312.

[14]Lionberger, pp. 333-334.

[15]Katz and Lazarsfeld, pp. 314-315.

[16]Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet, pp. 121-124.

[17]Kenneth G. Sheinkopf and M. Timothy O'Keefe, "The Eagleton Affair: A Study of News Diffusion", Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Montreal, Quebec, April, 1973.

[18]Wasudeo B. Padudkar, "Communication of Farm Innovations in an Indian Community", Indian Journal of Social Work, 17 (1963), 82-85.

[19]Menzel and Katz, pp. 342-345.

[20]Rogers and Shoemaker, pp. 198-225.

[21]Rogers and Svenning, pp. 227-229.

[22]Lionberger, pp. 333-334.

[23]Warren E. Miller, "The Political Behavior of the Electorate", in E. C. Dreyer & W. A. Rosenbaum (eds.), Political Opinion and Electoral Behavior, (Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1966), 85-102.

[24]David O. Sears, "Political Behavior", in G. Lindzey and E. Aronson, (eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume V, (Reading Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969), 315-458.

[25]Sidney Verba and Norman H. Nie, Participation in America, (New York: Harper and Row, 1972).

[26]Katz and Lazarsfeld, pp. 290-291.

[27]Lionberger, pp. 327-328.

[28]Katz and Lazarsfeld, pp. 292-293.

[29]Angus Campbell, Phillip Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes, The American Voter (New York: Wiley, 1960); Verba and Nie, pp. 100-101.

[30]Angus Campbell, Phillip Converse, Warren E. Miller and Donald E. Stokes,

Elections and the Political Order (New York: Wiley, 1966); Miller, pp. 87-89.

[31]Bernard R. Berelson, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee, Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954).

[32]Herbert McCloskey and Harold E. Dalgren, "Primary Group Influence on Party Loyalty", American Political Science Review, 53 (1959), 757-776; Campbell, et. al., 1960.

[33]Katz and Lazarsfeld, pp. 276-283.

[34]Virginia P. Richmond and James C. McCroskey, "Whose Opinion Do You Trust?" Journal of Communication, 25 (1975), 42-50.

[35] Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet, pp. 42-51.

[36]See Earl R. Babbie, Survey Research Methods, (Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1973).

[37]For elaboration of the procedures used in data collection see Peter A. Andersen, "The Effects of Source Credibility, Attraction, and Homophily on Voter Preference", Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, 1975; Peter A. Andersen and Robert J. Kibler, "The Effects of Source Credibility, Attraction, and Homophily on Voter Preference", Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Portland, Oregon, April, 1976.

[38]Everett M. Rogers and Donald G. Catarno, "Methods of Operationalizing Opinion Leadership", Public Opinion Quarterly 26 (1962), 435-441; Katz and Lazarsfeld, pp. 146-148; Rogers and Shoemaker, pp. 215-217.

[39]Jay Jacoby, "Construct Validity of Opinion Leadership", Public Opinion Quarterly, 47 (1974), 81-84.

[40]The Gallup Opinion Index, (Princeton, New Jersey: Gallup International,

August, 1972).

[41]Bradley S. Greenburg, "Voting Intentions, Election Expectations, and Exposure to Campaign Information", Journal of Communication 15 (1965) 149-160.

[42]Sidney Siegal, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956).

[43]Lionberger, pp. 333-334.

[44]Katz and Lazarsfeld, pp. 314-315.

[45]Hal R. Witteman and Peter A. Andersen, "The Polymorphic Opinion Leadership Test: Development and Validation", Paper presented at the Western Communication Association Convention, San Francisco, California, November, 1976.

Table 1

Chi Square Table for Political Opinion Leadership Level by Radio Usage

Degree of Opinion Leadership	Heard About Neither Candidate on Radio	Heard About One Candidate on Radio	Heard About Both Candidates on Radio	Totals
Very often	N = 55 19.9%*	9 31.0%*	11 32.3%*	75
Often	N = 41 14.8%*	7 24.1%*	7 20.6%*	55
Sometimes	N = 58 21.0%*	4 13.8%*	10 29.4%*	72
Seldom	N = 101 36.6%*	8 27.6%*	6 20.7%*	115
Never	N = 21 7.6%*	1 3.4%*	0 0.0%*	22
Totals	N = 276 100%	29 100%	34 100%	339

*Column percentages

Total Chi-Square = 13.65 with 8 D.F. Prob. Chi Sq. > .05

$r = .17$ $p < .002$
$r^2 = .03$
$x^2 = 13.65$ (Df = 8) $p > .02$

TABLE 2
The Relationship Between
Political Opinion
Leadership Level by Television Usage

Degree of Opinion Leadership	Heard About Neither Candidate on Television	Heard About One Candidate on Television	Heard About Both Candidates on Television	Totals
Very Often	N = 36 17.8%*	19 25.3%*	20 32.2%*	75
Often	N = 21 10.4%*	18 24.0%*	16 25.8%*	55
Sometimes	N = 43 21.3%*	17 22.7%*	12 19.3%*	72
Seldom	N = 84 41.6%*	18 24.0%*	13 20.1%*	115
Never	N = 18 8.9%*	3 4.0%*	1 1.6%*	22
Totals	N = 202 100%	75 100%	62 100%	339

*column percentages

$r = .26$ $p < .0001$

$r^2 = .07$

$x^2 = 29.17$ (Df = 8) $p < .0003$

Table 3

Chi Square Table for Political Opinion Leadership Level by Magazine Usage

Degree of Opinion Leadership	Heard About Neither Candidate in Magazines	Heard About One Candidate in Magazines	Heard About Both Candidates in Magazines	Totals
Very Often	N = 70 21.1%*	1 50.0%*	4 80.0%*	75
Often	N = 54 16.3%*	1 50.0%*	0 0.0%*	55
Sometimes	N = 71 21.4%*	0 0.0%*	1 20.0%*	72
Seldom	N = 115 34.6%*	0 0.0%*	0 0.0%*	115
Never	N = 22 6.6%*	0 0.0%*	0 0.0%*	22
Totals	N = 332 100%*	2 100%*	5 100%*	339

*column percentages

$r_2 = .16$ $p < .004$

$r_2 = .03$

$x^2 = 13.97$ (Df = 8) $p = .02$

TABLE 4

Chi-Square Table for Political Opinion Leadership Level by Newspaper Usage

Degree of Opinion Leadership	Heard About Neither Candidate in Newspapers	Heard About One Candidate in Newspapers	Heard About Both Candidates in Newspapers	Totals
Very Often	N = 23 15.6%*	20 27.4%*	32 26.9%*	75
Often	N = 13 8.8%*	15 20.6%*	27 22.7%*	55
Sometimes	N = 37 25.2%*	13 17.8%*	22 18.5%*	72
Seldom	N = 56 38.1%*	24 32.9%*	35 29.4%*	115
Never	N = 18 12.2%*	1 1.4%*	3 2.5%*	22
Totals	N = 147 100%	73 100%	119 100%	339

*column percentages

$r = .23$ $p < .0001$

$r^2 = .05$

$x^2 = 30.49$ (Df = 8) $p < .0002$

TABLE 5

Chi-Square Table for Political Opinion Leadership Level by Interpersonal Information

Degree of Opinion Leadership	Heard About Neither Candidate Through Interpersonal	Heard About One Candidate Through Interpersonal	Heard About Both Candidates Through Interpersonal	Totals
Very Often	N = 48 17.7%*	13 28.9%*	14 58.3%*	75
Often	N = 43 15.9%*	10 22.2%*	2 8.3%*	55
Sometimes	N = 57 21.1%*	11 24.4%*	4 16.7%*	72
Seldom	N = 102 37.8%*	9 20.0%*	4 16.7%*	115
Never	N = 20 7.4%*	2 4.4%*	0 0.0%*	22
Totals	N = 270 100%	45 100%	24 100%	339

*column percentages

$r = .25$ $p < .0001$

$r^2 = .06$

$x^2 = 27.90$ (Df = 8) $p < .0005$

TABLE 6

Chi-Square Table for Political Opinion Leadership by Age

Degree of Opinion Leadership	AGE 18-30	AGE 31-45	AGE 46-65	AGE Above 65	Total
Very Often	N = 26	29	15	5	75
	20.0%*	27.6%*	20.5%*	17.2%*	
Often	N = 26	15	10	4	55
	20.0%*	14.3%*	13.7%*	13.8%*	
Sometimes	N = 26	23	15	8	72
	20.0%*	21.9%*	20.5%*	27.6%*	
Seldom	N = 47	35	23	8	113
	36.1%*	33.3%*	31.5%*	27.6%*	
Never	N = 5	3	10	4	22
	3.8%*	2.8%*	13.7%*	13.8%*	
Total	N = 130	105	73	29	337
	100%*	100%	100%	100%	

*column percentages

$r_2 = .07$ $p > .02$

$r_2 = .00$

$x^2 = 16.76$ (Df = 12) $p > .02$

Table 7

The Relationship Between
Sex, Preference Formation
and Opinion Leadership

	DF	Mean Square	F	P	Omega^2
Sex	1	10.25	6.58	<.01	.02
Preference	1	13.81	8.86	<.003	.03
Sex * Preference	1	1.20	.77	>.05	.00
Error	329	1.56			
Total	332				

Table 8

Table of Opinion Leadership
Means for Sex and
Preference Formation

		PREFERENCE	NO PREFERENCE	TOTALS
SEX	Males	3.46	3.21	3.37
	Females	3.25	2.74	3.00
	Totals	3.33	2.88	